DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 292 CS 203 005

TITLE	Options in Education, Transcript for November 10, 1975: College Enrollment, Standardized Testing, Hyperactive School Children, Sex Discrimination in Education, Telephone Installation, and Adult Functional Competence.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.; National Public Radio, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D.C.; National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	22p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; Drug Therapy; *Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Influences; Functional Illiteracy; Higher Education; Hyperactivity; *Interviews; *News Reporting; *Radio; Scripts; Sex Discrimination; Standardized Tests
IDENTIFIERS	Options in Education

ABSTRACT

"Options in Education" is a radio news program which focuses on issues and developments in education. This transcript of the show contains discussions of college enrollment; standardized testing; hyperactivity in school children, the drugs given to these children, and the biochemical effects of artificial flavors and colors on hyperactive children; sex discrimination in education; learning how to install a telephone (a new job for women); and adult functional competence. Participants in the program are John Merrow and Wendy Blair, moderators; Marshall Smith, National Institute of Education; Margaret Dunkle, Association of American Colleges' Project on Women; Janice Campbell, telephone installer; Peter Schrag, author of "The Myth of the Hyperactive Child"; Susan Stamberg, National Public Radio; and Ben Feingold, author of "Why Your Child Is Hyperactive." (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Merrow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

ED130292

CS 203 005

Options in Education

OPTIONS IN EDUCATION

November 10, 1975

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

npr National Public Radio

JM: John Merrow, Moderator
WB: Wendy Blair, Moderator
MS: Dr. Marshall Smith, National Institute of Education
MD: Margaret Dunkle, Association of American College's Project on Women
JC: Janice Campbell, Telephone Installer
PS: Peter Schrag, Author, The Myth of the Hyperactive Child
SS: Susan Stamberg, All Things Considered, National Public Radio.
BF: Dr. Ben Feingold, Author, Why Your Child is Hyperactive

WB: I'm Wendy Blair, with NPR's Options in Education.

(MUSIC)

WB: Options in Education is a news magazine about all the issues and developments in education, from the ABCs of primary education to the alphabet soup of government programs. If you've ever been to school, we have something that will interest you!

(MUSIC)

WB: Last week we reported an unexpected surge in college enrollments, that is 10.6 million americans are now going to college the most ever. John Merrow has more on that story.

JM: Not everyone is happy about the record increase. Many students are finding that the courses they want to take are already full. The New York Times reports that students are flocking to job-related courses in business administration, economics, agriculture and engineering. Economics is now the largest department at Harvard, and the enrollment in first and second year economics courses at Ohio State University increased 24 per cent. The reason for the trend is student concern over future employment. They are looking for a major that seems to promise a job after graduation. Many public colleges and universities are having difficulty coping with the record number of students. The Chronicle of Higher Education reports that some schools have adopted enrollment restrictions, because their budgets are already strectched thin. The State University of New York has decided to hold enrollment at current levels at 20 of its campuses for the next five years. Michigan State University will limit enrollment in its winter and spring terms. Enrollment has already been closed for the spring term at one University of Illinois campus. Many faculty members applaud putting the lid on. They feel they are now being asked to teach bigger classes and yet are not receiving bigger paychecks.

(Button: Child counting on fingers)

WB: That student did well on John's non standardized test, and maybe the standardized test scores are falling because children just don't have enough time to count on their fingers. Whatever the reason, the scores are falling dramatically. Some people interpret this decline as evidence of educational misdirection or national decay, but Dr. Marshall Smith of the National Institute of Education is not so gloomy. He gives John Merrow his overview of the situation.

MS: We have to look at the combination of both long-term trends and short-term trends and the recent newspaper articles have all referred to the short-term trends or have referred to tests of the sort you just mentioned which in fact has no indication of a trend, it just has an indication of a cross-section of society right now. I think if you look at the long-term trends the picture becomes much more positive. If you look at the short-term trends in the picture it is really quite confusing. Some scores are going up and some scores are going down. Let me briefly run over three points on the long-term trends and we can talk a little about that. If you look at the IQ scores of Americans over the past fifty or so years, there has been an increase in our IQ scores of roughly a quarter to a sixty of the standard deviation every decade.

JM: What does that mean in terms of points?

MS: That means three and a half, four points every decade. Averaged out across fifty years, gives you a 15 point increase on the average. That is a considerable amount. Now what that means is that if the society was scoring at 100 on the average in 1915 they are now scoring at an average of 115.

JM: Americans are smarter than ever.

MS: Americans are smarter than ever, that is right.

JM: That is the first piece of good news in a long time. Let me interrupt, though. IQ scores are very much out of fashion, they are thought to be unreliable or just a dangerous kind of thing to bandy about.

MS: I don't think they are unreliable so much --

JM: That is a scientific word.

MS: They only represent one way of looking at individuals and they may not represent the kinds of skills that people have in the society. There appears a kind of a general skill. Verbal fluencies, number of fluency and so on. One more piece of data about IQs we should know about. Robert Thorndyke at Columbia Teachers College has recently been renorming the standard Banay IQ in order to make the gest standardized for the present population and he finds really quite dramatic gains among young children. Pre-school children in particular are gaining about ten points in that thirty-year period. The gains drop off until about the age of 12 or so there are no gains at all. So we have got our perhaps smarter young children since 1930 and stable adults, adults who have remained at pretty much the same level.

JM: Now when you say renorming, I suppose that is a way of adjusting tests so that it is accurate, today.

MS: That is right. It represents a bunch of things, I think. The language does change.

JM: Is it akin to, say turning your car?

MS: That is right. Words that were in fashion a few years ago may not be in fashion now, they may not be appropriate to the test. Young kids might not know them and even older people may not know them. I think these are very positive findings, that the society in fact has grown more literate,

perhaps it has grown brighter, as you indicated before. I think perhaps we can look back at the incredible increase from about 1920 through about 1965, 1970. In the college-going rates, in the average years of schooling kids have gone through. You look at the averages in schooling in about 1970, 71, you find that the average person in the white population has gone to school about 12.4 years. The average black person in the society has gone to school about 11.8 years. Not a great deal of difference. There is gap that has closed, there, but it also indicates that most people are graduating from high school and if you do graduate from high school you have got to be at least given some sensitivity to the needs for literacy. You have got to be given basic literacy training whereas 40 to 50 years ago a large part of the population wasn't even getting through the third grade or the fourth grade.

JM: So there has been progress there?

MS: Great progress, I think.

JM: Let's move to the question of declining SAT scores. There are declining scores on tests taken by graduating high school seniors.

MS: The SAT scores as everyone I think now knows have gone dow fairly dramatically over the past ten years and as you have mentioned they have gone down even more dramatically in the past two years or so. The SAT has a norm of 500.

JM: Scored on the basis of 200 to 800?

MS: That is right. And most people fall or were scheduled to fall -- that is, they tried to develop a test -- most people would fall between 400 to 600. A much smaller proportion would fall above 600, a much smaller proportion would fall below 400. We find that in 1966 the average score was 466 and that is already considerably lower than 500 so there may have been a slight decline in the ten or fifteen years before that. In 1974, 1975, that school year, the average score was 434, or a decline of 32 points, which can be translated into a decline of about three-tenths of a standard deviation. It is all very technical. But that has great implications for the number of kids above and below these high levels.

JM: And if you look closely --

MS: Above 600 and below 400.

JM: And if you look closely at the data you will find the main reason for that drop in average score is the absence of -- is the drop in people scoring over 600. Fewer and fewer kids -- 20 per cent fewer last year scored above 600 so one of the questions is, where have all the bright kids gone?

MS: That is a good question. Educational Testing Service, the institution which administers this test, has clearly been very concerned about this. They have explored an awful lot of different possible explanations. One explanation, of course, is that you may have a different group of kids taking the tests now than before, so maybe children from differnt high school who have had less training and so on, in 1974, 75, than had it in 1966-67. That doesn't seem to explain the difference, though. They have also explored issues about the motivation level, they have tried to explore issues about the motivation level with children. That is still a strong speculation on the part of a large number of people.

JM: Last week on OPTIONS IN EDUCATION, Bernard McKenna of the NEA suggested an awful lot of bright kids were simply waking up to the irrelevance of these tests.

MS: That is clearly another speculation. We have no hard data on

anything like this, though. The only possible corroborating data for something like that, or at least it is an inference that could be made -- would come from the notion that most children now, most people not if they have got the money can go to college. The tests themselves don't really determine whether you go or whether you don't go to college. And if you look at something called PSATS, the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Tests which are taken by 11th graders you will find those scores have not dropped.

JM: What does that mean?

MS: We have no drop in the scores of one group of kids in the 11th grade, while a pretty similar group of kids in the 12th grade are dropping substantially. It is very strange. There was a test score conference a little while ago sponsored by the National Institute of Education and of course one speculation was that the kids grow stupider from 11th to 12th grade. That doesn't seem reasonable. But it may be that once they have scored well on the PSATs, that they don't take the SATs. They don't take the SAT -- the 12th grade test -- seriously, so they go in without adequate sleep, they go in without adequate preparation. Perhaps they are not as highly motivated while they are there so the scores drop. They know they can get into college anyway so it doesn't appear to be a critical factor to them in their own thinking. Mr. McKenna's idea may well be accurate. I think until we know a heck of a lot more about it, though, I don't think we can be sanquine with this tremendous drop from 800 to 700 which is far more dramatic since the distribution tails of the distribution drop off very, very rapidly.

JM: This is that question of, where have all the bright kids gone?

MS: Yes. It is not only above 600 which has only dropped 20 per cent or so as you indicated, it is above 700 which has dropped well over 50 per cent. Now that could have some grave consequences for society. If it is really reflecting.

JM: What kind of consequences?

MS: In the long run it may be limiting the pool of very bright people going into certain kinds of scientific occupations, for instance, going to medicine, going into a variety of things where a tremendous amount of information has to be stored and put together by the individual and treated responsibly. We just don't know.

JM: I would like to move back to another way of looking at these tests. The National Assessment and the College Board type scores both found surprising differences between men and women, boys and girls. It seems that for example in college boys' scores, both men and women scores are dropping but the women's scores are dropping faster than men, on both verbal and mathematics. Now normally in the past men had scored better on the math and women had scored better on the verbal. That is not true any more. The same pattern seems to be showing up in the National Assessment. What is going on?

MS: That is true but the differences are really very slight. There used to be in 1966-67, for instance, a five point difference between males and females on the SAT verbal with the females scoring somewhat higher, 468 compared to 463. Very small. Now the females have dropped more. In fact they are now scoring six points below what the males are scoring. 437 to 431. A number of people have been alarmed about this. I personally am not as alarmed as some. I think that differences of that magnitude could easily happen from changes in the population of people taking the test and they could be explained away in effect. There is, though, I think until we get much harder data on this issue, certainly evidence there for concern. Again the motivational issues may be important. Women may now know they can get into college more easily than they knew before so they don't have to work as hard, or think they have to work as

hard when they are taking a test. A lot of possibilities. I don't believe women are becoming less bright than men. In my experience I guess it is the opposite way around.

JM: One point. It is not the effect of Women's Liberation. That point may be worth making. Because these tests don't measure what has happened in the last year or two years of your life. They measure what has been going on with all the influences your life. So if Women's Liberation is going to have an effect on test scores it won't show up until ten years down the road or so.

MS: That is right. I think -- complete speculation, now. As you indicated, there has always been a very strong difference between the scores in mathematics for males and females. In 1966-67, the difference was about 45,50 points. In 1974, it is again about 45 points. So there hasn't been a greater decline but the fact that females are still a half a standard deviation behind, 50 points behind males on math tests may change as Women's Liberation encourages women to get into the sciences, to get into mathematics. Not to believe that those are jobs that are solely the province of men.

JM: You know I often think, Mike -- and, of course, you are a researcher from the National Institute of Education, and you probably don't share this view but I often think we are over-tested in the society and we over-trumpet the results without taking time to think about them. This is one of the reasons I appreciate your coming here today. And what made me go through this thought process last week was reading about a study which revealed that fat kids do better on IQ tests than skinny kids. I wanted to ask you about that. What does that all mean?

MS: I don't think it means very much of anything.

JM: Actually I think it was very fat kids do better than very skinny kids.

MS: Obese children was the term that they used. I guess I agree with you pretty much. I think the society has willy nilly jumped into a frame of mind that encouraging testing, that encourages use of this kind of standardized tests for accountability purposed and it has often been noted by people who worry about this kind of issue that these standardized tests don't really give us very much indication about what the schools themselves are teaching. We are talking about generalized verbal tests, generalized mathematical tests.

JM: I think the most important thing from where I sit is that they don't give you all that much information about a specific individual.

MS: That is right.

JM: I think it is a great mistake to judge your kid on the basis of one standardized or even standardized test scores.

MS: A great mistake. There is always a very large what we call a standard area of measurement. On the SATs, I don't have an accurate data on this but I believe the standard is somewhere in the area of thirty points.

JM: So the standard errors even out if you look at a whole group of 100,000 kids but if you are just looking at your kid.

MS: Just one child, that is right.

JM: Be very careful.

MS: You also find in the early years that children mature at very different rates. An IQ difference of 10, 15, 20 points in the early years between two children who are exactly the same age let's say may disappear completely at the age of 14. It may be one child has just matured more rapidly in the

first four or five years of his life. The other child will catch up. It is something that everybody has to recognize. There are tremendous individual differences even among children who will end up at the same place by the time they are 20 or even 15.

WB: Marshall Smith of NIE, recent headlines suggest that 20% of adult Americans cock the skills to cope with modern life. More from Smith on Part II, concentrating on the tests of adult competence, later in this program. This subject a little later in the program, John?

JM: An overreliance on tests may be a major educational problem (in the yes of) educators, but it generally isn't reflected in public polls they are contradictory. (They say that Americans trust educators and believe in education,) (and yet that education costs too much, think the schools are loosely run and often dangerous) (and what integration but no busing.) Next week I will be reporting on a citizens' group which believes that nobody is in charge of the schools anymore. Well, we would like to know how you feel about American education, and so we plan to turn Options in Education over to our listeners--that is, to you. We want you to tell us what you think the problems--and the solutions--are. The program will be a call-out, because this program is taped in advance. You will have to call us, leave your name and number, and then w. will call you back. If you will get a pencil ready, I will give you the number to call. Then call us, leave your name, address, phone number, and a brief indication of what you want to talk about. The number is 202-785-6464. We hope to call out to listeners once a month, so call and help make Options in Education national and public. We're already radio. (The number again: 202-785-6464.)

WB: If the line is busy, do keep trying, try agai.. We want to hear from you.

BUTTON: ("What do you want to be--a nurse?")

WB: American society is changing, and the old certainties about a women's place seem to be breaking down. Sex Discrimination in education is (prohibited by) Title IX of the education amendments, which became law in 1972, although it wasn't until 1975 that the government regulations telling what the law means went into effect. Margaret Dunkle of the Association of American College's (Project on Women) gives some examples of sex discrimination in education.

JM: What kind of sex discrimination goes on in educational institutions that Title IX is aimed at eradicating?

MD: Perhaps the most obvious kind of discrimination is discrimination in admissions. Traditionally there have been double standards for men and women in admission policies. Men and women if they rank separately the woman has to have higher credentials to get admitted into a college, university or school. There have been single sex classes so that a girl in high school had to take home economics and couldn't take shop and a boy in high school had to take shop and couldn't take home economics and this kind of differentiation are some of the things Title IX is trying to address.

JM: What else is Title IX addressing?

MD: The area of student rules and regulations that differentiate on the basis of sex. Whether it is dress codes, hair length regulations --

JM: Do you mean if a school has a hair length regulation it must apply equally to boys and girls, to men and women?

MD: That is right, to both sexes. To men and women. The Title IX regulation is pretty clear that different standards of,

for example, hair length, are not consistent with Title IX. Another area is in terms of admissions to academic types of classes. For example, an engineering class or a coaching class has sometimes been single sex. Or physical education class has traditionally been single sex. There is an exemption for some instruction in physical education for contact sports but non-contact sports like archery, golf or tennis have to be co-educational.

JM: So that boys and girls alike can try out for the gold team?

MD: In terms of athletics there is a series of rather complicated standards in determining whether or not it can be a single sex team or whether it has to be co-educational.

JM: Could you boil down those complex regulations for us?

MD: Basically for competitive athletics schools they can have a separate team for girls and for boys, for men and women if they want to. If they just have one team, say they just have a boys tennis team, if the opportunities for/other sex over all had been previously limited -- that is if girls hadn't had many sports opportunities in the past, then they have to be allowed to try out for that single sex tean. Unless it is a contact sport. It is really complicated. In terms of contact sports, say you have a football team. Even if you don't have the same type of opportunity for the other sex, you don't have a girl's football team, and even if the girls' opportunities had been limited in the past then you still don't have to let them try out for the football team because that is a contact sport and the regulation makes a distinction between non-contact sports and contact sports.

JM: Now in reading the newspapers, Margaret, I get in the impression that Title IX is solely about football and about sports in general. Now our conversation has just kind of wandered into the sports arena. Why is it that so much attention is being paid to Title IX and to sports?

MD: I think there are a number of reasons. One is that discrimination in sports and athletics is very obvious. You have a team, you don't have a team. It is not like a more settle type of discrimination that can go on. I think another reason too is that the types of attitudes which don't want to see women competing in sports, in athletics, are the same types of attitudes that have kept women out of a number of other untraditional sorts of areas, whether it is business executive, lawyer, or doctor.

JM: Is it a kind os a macho, competitive, masculine --

MD: I think it is an image about what girls should do and what boys should do and for a lot of people it is extremely difficult to imagine a strong woman running on the playing field, just as it is difficult for them to imagine a woman president or a woman doctor or a woman lawyer or a woman executive.

JM: Some of them should come out with me in one of the road runners events. You get in a ten mile race and a number of women just kind of go trotting right by you. That is a salutary experience, I suspect. I noticed in the paper the other day that the athletic director at Oregon State University said he would rather quit than comply with Title IX. Now is that a common reaction on the part of men in athletics?

MD: Some men in athletics and the NCAA, the National Collegiate Athletic Association has really spear-headed a campaign against the Title IX regulations, against Title IX, itself. There are, however, a large number of men in athletics, male administrators, who support the idea that their daughter should get the same educational opportunities and the same sports opportunity in schools that their son can get. So it is mixed. Some people strongly oppose and a large number of people really support the concept that the realities of regulation.

JM: What kind of impact is Title IX having on the nation's elementary and secondary schools?

MD: It is having a tremendous impact on the schools from kindergarten right through graduate schools. In terms of elementary and secondary schools we are seeing single sex classes go by the wayside.

JM: Boys are now taking Home economics, girls are now taking shop?

MD: Right. We are seeing more attention paid to the status of the women employed in the elementary and secondary schools. There is a tremendous number of women in the elementary and secondary schools. Very few of them reach top level administrative positions. We are seeing increased emphasis on what the curriculum, what the test books say about the roles of men and women and even though the Title IX regulation doesn't specifically address textbooks -- it says the government is not going to get into the textbooks business, there -- the thrust evaluating the whole educational program for equal opportunity is leading school district after school district and local citizens group after school citizens group to take a look at what the textbooks are teaching their daughters and their sons. We are seeing increased opportunities in terms of physical education. A number of elementary schools have in the past in third grade separated the boys from the girls and the boys went out and played ball and the girls had to make do for themselves on the playground. Well, in third grade, most girls are as big as or bigger then the boys and as strong as or stronger than the boys so there is really no physiological reason why they shouldn't participate in sports together, even competitive sports. So we are seeing schools reassess this and start to give the boys and the girls the same types of physical education opportunities. We are seeing dress codes being equalized or going by the wayside. We are seeing different standards of punishment going by the wayside. For example, in some schools only boys were spanked and girls were sent home. Or boys were dismissed for rowdiness and girls weren't. There were different standards used based on sex. We are seeing that go by the wayside.

JM: You say we are seeing, and you have repeated that phrase as you have enumerated the impact Title IX is having. You say we are seeing. Who is seeing? Is someone keeping a close eye on what is happening?

MD: There is a number of projects that are monitoring Title IX, in one way or another. In addition to HEW's Office of Civil Rights which is charged with enforcing Title IX, generally. There is our project at the Association of American Colleges, and there is the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education in the National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. Thes projects are in one way or another trying to keep the fingers on the pulse of what is happening with Title IX compliance. Although there isn't a tremendous amount of hard statistical information about what is going on and how institutions are going about complying with Title IX, there is a lot of anecdotal type of information that confirms the types of things that I was talking about.

JM: Is there a great deal of misinformation about what Title IX means?

MD: Yes, there is a tremendous amount of misinformation. In the sports area, I think a lot of people think that Title IX means you have to spend exactly the same amount of money for females and for males, and the Title IX regulation says you don't have to spend exactly the same amount of money, you don't have to have equal aggregate expenditures. What you have to have is overall equal opportunity and we are not going to measure that just in terms of dollars and cents. There is misunderstanding in terms of when title IX is effect. Title IX was effective back in the summer of 1972. The Title IX regulation

became effective this past summer and for a couple of areas there is an adjustment period in the area of sports and physical education. Elementary schools have a year to bring their programs fully into line and high school and colleges have three years to bring their programs into line and a lot of people think that that one year, that three year adjustment period applies to everything. It doesn't. It is just merely sports and physical education.

JM: So people are supposed to be getting into compliance, now?

MD: Yes, and every single covered institution or other group that receives federal education money is supposed to be right now conducting an evaluation of their programs to determine whether or not there is sex discrimination, whether or not there is sex bias and whether or not they are in compliance with the Title IX regulations. And schools are supposed to have that completes by next July.

WB: Margaret Dunkle of the Association of American Colleges Project on Women.

(Button- teachers messages to the office)

WB: Old habits are hard to change but dramatic changes are occuring nevertheless. Women are filling jobs once reserved for men, and vice-versa. We're interested in learning how people learn all sorts of skills, and every week in our regular feature "Learning To"...we report on how people learn to drive a bus, bake a bagel. When a reversal of sex roles is involved, the learning process is complicated. Janice Campbell did learn - and here's how.

JM: What kind of work do you do?

JC: I am a telephone installer.

JM: How on earth did you get to be a telephone installer? I must have been seeing telephone installers now for years and I have never seen a woman installing telephones.

JC: I started out in a business office and then they started putting men in the business office, so very soon the men were promoted over the women and we sat there. One day I got a little bit upset about it and said, "Where can I go," so they sent me to another building which is called the central office and I think I was the third woman in Virginia ever to do frame work, which is what it was formerly called, and in the central office I was there two and half years and I got promoted to installer and here I am. Basically it is all on-the-job training. You are sent around with another man generally and he shows you how to read the orders and what phones to put in, what type of sets, what colors, and then he shows you how to hook all the wires up, and that is where you go.

JM: Is it hard to learn?

JC: No, not at all. It is very very simple. It is just one basic color code which is universal and once you get the color code down then you are pretty much all set.

JM: Why haven't there been women in this before?

JC: Because it was always considered a male profession by the Bell System, basically. It is just recently that they are allowing women to get into it and that is because of the EOC pressure.

JM: So they are putting pressure -- if it was always considered a male occupation, is that because people in the Bell System didn't think women were smart enough or tough enough or what?

JC: Well, there is a lot of hard, physical work involved, carrying a lot of equipment, a lot of cables which can weigh probably twenty-five, thirty pounds. Other different types of equipment

which get really heavy and so they always thought only men could do it. It also involves pulling cable from the floor to floor or 200 feet along the floor, something like that. And it is pretty hard work physically.

JM: Are you strong enough?

JC: I can generally -- if I can't do it, I can get someone to help me.

JM: What kind of reactions do you run into as a female telephone installer?

JC: Everything. Everything. From curiosity to dismay. A lot of it, I think, is fear, also, from the men I work with. They aer afraid that women are taking over and that I am going to get promoted before they do or get raises before they do, and there is just a lot of general dissent.

JM: Are those legitimate fears?

JC: No, I don't think so.

JM: When you say dismay, what do you mean, what form does that reaction take?

JC: Most of the men I ran into believe that a woman belongs in the home and I get that about ten times a day. They will come up to me and say, "Why aren't you at home taking care of your children?"

JM: Why aren't you?

JC: I need the money. I am here because of the money. It is that simple. And they get dismayed if I can do something because they don't expect me to be able to. I guess they figure that I am either too unintelligent or not physically able to do it and if I can accomplish the job, they get very dismayed. They want me to fail.

JM: In other words they are threatened by your presence somewhat I hear you saying.

JC: Yes, they really are.

JM: What about their wives. Do you suppose that the wives of the men you work with are threatened by your working with their husbands?

JC: There are seven men in our crew and I am the only female. When I was brought in my boss received phone calls from three different wives complaining that I was not to work with their husbands. They were very upset. They didn't want a woman working with their husbands. I had never met the women, I had never seen them and they had never even seen me and yet they called to say that they do not want their husbands to work with a women.

JM: What do you conclude from that about them and about their husbands?

JC: I feel that the wives are pretty insecure and that the husbands aren't doing enough to convince then that they love them and they are not going to go out and fool around on the job.

JM: This is becoming a sex-centered interview, too. I am asking all these questions about just the sexual aspect of your job. Let me change the subject and then later on I will ask you what you are doing afterward. But what happens -- what about your children, for example? Are they learning differently about what kinds of jobs are open to them? For example, if you have a daughter, is her head being changed about the kind of job she might have when she grows up?

JC: I am trying to do that on, I think, a good level. She asks me what I do and naturally I tell her. I have one five and one three, so they are still a little young to start worrying about jobs. But when she comes home and says, "Mummy, I want to be a ballerina," or "I want to be a doctor," I try to reinforce this positively by saying, "You can do anything you want to do. Anyhting at all. All you have to do is try for it and if you need education, get the education, and if it needs practice, do the practicing. But other than that, there are absolutely no limits as to what you can do if you want to.

JM: But she does say she wants to be a doctor. She doesn't say, "I think I will be a nurse"?

JC: No, she says Doctor.

JM: You know everybody says the world is falling to Hell but there are some changes that are for the better and maybe that is one of them.

JC: I hope so. I really do.

JM: "Learning To...."will regularly examine a variety of skills how we get them. The on-going National Assessment of Education Progress and a recent study of adult functional competence indicate that a lot of Americans may not be acquiring some very important basic skills. The National Assessment, which has been testing a sample of Americans in and out of school, has discovered that many of us lack essential mathematical and reading skills. Only 16 per cent of the young adults (age 25-35) could balance a checkbook correctly, for example. In basic math---like figuring out the price per ounce of food, or the number of hours required to cook a 9 1/2 pound turkey --men and boys did better than women and girls. (Maybe that simply means that men should do the shopping and cooking.)

WB: That test of adult competence found that 20 percent of adult americans--that means 23 million people--lack the basic know-how to be effective citizens, or consumers, or wage earners or family members. Marshall Smith of the National Institute of Education and John try to make some sense of this startling finding.

JM: As you indicated the National Assessment has been putting out some data recently. We find that between 1970 and 1974, the science scores went down very slightly. Marginal but I think statistically significant. Two points on a scale of 100 points or so. They also found, however, in a more recent study that the reading scores had gone up very slighltly but about the same amount that the science scores had gone down. So the picture is not at all clear. The National Assessment of scores is not dealing only with the college-going population, it is dealing with the entire population.

MS: Both the National Assessment and this other test of testing the basic know-how in effect are kind of a new wrinkle in testing. It is the idea we are not just testing kids that are going to college and not just testing their reading and mathematical skills in a classroom but there is some sort of test on how well they can function outside school, or can they balance a checkbook and so forth.

JM: Now those two tests in particular, Mike, what are we finding out about the American society as a whole?

MS: Well, I think we are becoming more realistic in out testing. At a beginning, those questions aren't so esoteric. They don't ask analogy kinds of questions or esoteric knowledge questions. What they are doing is trying to focus on whether people can balance checkbooks, whether they can read the fine print in legal documents like wills or rental forms; whether or not they can be a competent consumer. It is a kind of a consumer orientation.

MS: What I think they are finding out is that there is this group of people in the society that, for a variety of reasons, largely training, I believe, do not graduate from high school with the competencies to fo on and really be citizens, anywhere near the options most of us just take for granted.

JM: You say a large group?

MS: Well, Norvel Northcut in his most recent study coming out of Texas estimated they are about 20 per cent. A study by the Lou Harris Poll five years ago estimated about the same number of people that really had quite a great deal of problems with very simple reading, very simple computational -- but skills that are based in a way that we have to operate in society.

JM: It is usually called functional literacy or functional competency?

MS: That is right.

JM: It essentially means can you, for example, read the sign on the front of the bus that tells where that bus is going because if you can't read it --

MS: You are in trouble. It gets a little more complicated. He would like to be able to read the bus schedule and that takes a little more skill and you would like to make a comparison between whether you ought to take a bus or a train or an airplane to get to a place in a certain time.

JM: By comparing arrival times and so on and so forth, and cost?

MS: That is right. That gets more complicated.

JM: It is a kind of achievement testing, too, because it asks for example, what does it mean if you say: We are an equal opportunity employer.

MS: That is right.

JM: They find a fair number of people don't know what the means. They ask what a credit check is. A number of people thought that was money?

MS: That is right. I think in the past individual teachers may have concentrated on things like this but by and large school systems assumed when they were teaching children traditional subjects that they would pretty much learn the kinds of functional skills we have just been talking about as a fall-out. That they would just naturally accrue them.

JM: Well, are these tests proven? But things are different, now. Things are beginning to be different. Are these tests proving that in fact Americans aren't picking up these things on the side.

MS: Some Americans, remember. It is not all Americans by any means. It is 20 per cent, many of them are in the older age populations. Many of them -- I suspect although I haven't seen the data from this most recent one, may have been immigrants, they may have language difficulty problems in English -- perhaps not in their own language. The second generation, their children probably won't have these same problems. But I think there is a movement going on in schools which tends directly to this issue. Competency-based education. In oregon, for example, there is now a state law that requires that Oregon try out a set of criteria before a child graduates from high school. And among those criteria are these functionally based skills. He has to be able to do certain things.

JM: We will be looking closely at that whole issue later on in another program. Mike, last week on OPTIONS IN EDUCATION, Terry Herndon, who is exceutive director of the National Education Association, suggested that one reason schools were

being criticized so much -- and of course they are being criticized tremendously -- and this test bruhaha is a part of it -- he suggested one reason is that they are doing so well, that in fact if 20 per cent of the adults can't cope with life or whatever those test results mean, 80 per cent can and that is a tremendous, tremendous improvement and shows how well the schools are doing. The result Herndon suggested is that you have an educated population which in turn looks critically, knows what it wants from schools and gets involved in the schools and therefore is criticial of the schools.

MS: That is a very healthy attitude. As I indicated in the beginning, in the beginning of our discussion, we have has a quite strong increase in test scores, IQ scores and so on in the population over the last fifty years. It may be that as the sociologists call it, we are in a period of relative deprivation. As we have claimed a great deal and we can look back and we can see that there is some small part of the population who haven't received the same kinds of gains or haven't gained the same amount as some of the rest of us, and yet we now believe that those same kinds of gains should accrue to everybody, that, in the society, not just a select few, as the educational system of a hundred years ago or two hundred years ago defined it is. It should be universal, universal education, and the university effect of education.

JM: Mike Smith of the National Institute of Education explaining what all those test scores mean in this period of relative deprivation. Thanks a lot, Mike.

(tease: mother's little helper)

WB: Parents sometimes do resort to pills for themselves, and now also for their children. Millions of children are being falsely diagnosed as hyperactive or learning disabled, and several hundred thousand are being drugged-legally or according to Peter Schrag and Diane Divoky who've written a book on the subject of Hyperactivity, published by Random House. NPR's Susan Stamberg, and John Merrow, ask Schrag about the side-effects of the most commonly used drug, Ritalin.

Q: Let's get on to the subject of drugs. When the guy in the community, the so-called expert says what your kid needs is ritalin, is that how you pronounce it?

PS: That is the most common one, yes.

Q: What is the danger involved in that?

PS: The dangers are multiple. The clear physical problem of side effects which are numerous. It depends on the case, the individual and so on. I am certainly not saying this happens in every case but in many cases kids suffer a number of side effects which go from nausia, headaches, all the way up to in a few cases psychotic episodes, like psychotic hallucinations. Let's remember that ritalin is an amphetamine type of drugs. It is something that operates like speed and it is certainly an upper and there are kids who have suffered psychotic episodes as a result of this and hallucinations and nightmares and all that. That is the one set of dangers. The second set of dangers which are somewhat more long range is that there seems to be evidence that on the average most kids suffer -- there are now two or three studies indicating that on the average most kids suffer irreversible weight and height loss. Almost everybody or many people whose kids are on this -- they talk about how the kid is a bag of bones and the assumption was that they would regain this loss after they went off the drug. It now appears that in fact they do not, they do not regain all of this loss and there are now a couple of studies that suggest that. The third danger is that although there is no evidence that the drug is addictive, there is certainly some indication that the drug created a psychological dependency or a social dependency. Not only in the sort of general sense

that the kid learns that his good behavior depends on this technological intervention, but that in some cases at least if not in a great many, if a kid is on it for a long range of time then whatever internal controls he might develop unassisted by the drug he will not develop so the kids come off it at the age of fourteen and rather than being 60 pounds, they are 140 pounds, they are fourteen years old and they are still at whatever they were when then went on it.

Q: But how were they doing in school? They have stopped fidgeting, haven't they, they are able to concentrate better, aren't they?

Q: Yes and often their parents like them better and their teachers like them better. However, their school performance on any kind of test score in any kind of learning does not change. That is, if the kid is basically doing C work when he goes on, he is basically going to do C work when he comes off. You can't throw those likeability out the window. It is important that the child is suddenly liked by teachers and parents? That does something for him.

PS: That is right. If you decide that is important enough to drug somebody and risk all these other things, great, and I think that is a decision that all of us make. I mean that is sort of saying, "Well, I am going to take speed to make me popular," or "to make my mother like me." Somebody argued this afternoon and said, "Well, they get along better with their peers.." My God, we are going to shoot kids full of this stuff so thier friends will like them better.

Q: It is only used on a temporary basis though, isn't it, the drug? It is only prescribed that way? You figure it will last for as long as the kid is in that particular difficult phase.

PS: Well, temporary -- twice a day, five days a week for ten years?

Q: Well now even there is one of the interesting things about Peter and Diane Eastbook is the way liberal kinds of reform seem to lead to greater excess. For instance, you mentioned the FDA got upset about this drug and placed some limits on the kind of prescriptions which simply led to doctors, according to your book, writing larger and larger prescriptions. Instead of prescribing a thousand pills, they prescribed 5,000.

PS: Right and for the reason the FDA got concerned was, in this case there was evidence the drug was being abused considerably and nobody could count for half -- that was true for all amphetamins. I mean there was some evidence that indicated nobody could account for half of the production which meant that half the production went into the underground drug trade, presumably. And certainly this stuff was being disolved and shot up and used for all kind of other things.

Q: Peter, could you explain why it is that an amphetamine, an upper works the opposite way, apparently, to bring kids down?

PS: They used to talk about the paradoxical effect that it worked one way for adults or normal people and another way for these hyperactive kids. In fact it works the same way for everybody. It enables people in certain dosages among certain people to concentrate better and to increase their attention span. In particularly routinized kinds of things. Even though it does not enhance learning, it does not increase that, it does enable you to do sort of routine tasks like typing or adding long columns of figures or something like that. And that is a familiar kind of phenomenon. It is the same kind of thing where college students used to take -- may still do -- take all this stuff to cram for exams and that kind of business.

Q: For the properly carefully diagnosed hyperkinetic child, or the child with the learning disability which has been accurately diagnosed, don't these drugs help?

PS: Well the question is what is diagnosis. I mean you can't diagnose a learning disability. A learning disability is simply a lable for something else. A kid can't read as much

or as well as he might or he has a problem of coordination. Sure there are neurological problems. Hand-eye coordination, people are clumsy -- I mean all of that kind of stuff. Small motor, large motor. All these wonderful term we use. So you call somebody learning disabled or whatever. That doesn't help you operationally. I mean then you still have to go back to what is the problem, what is it that you want the kid to do that he is not doing. What is it operationally. That is the difficulty. He reverses letters. He sees things upside down. He writes was when he should be writing saw. That kind of thing. So deal with that. Now as far as the drugs are concerned, the drugs are never -- I mean one thing has to be clear. People talk about treatment. The drug has nothing to do with treatment. The drug has to do with control and measurement.

Q: And maintenance.

PS: And maintenance. The theory is you keep him on this drug until he has outgrown whatever this problem is and he won't develop a secondary problem where he gets psychotic because he is too jumpy or people don't like him or something so you keep him on this. It is kind of a maintenance thing. As I say, all of those other things happen. As I say, there is no accurate diagnosis of learning disabilities. There is an accurate diagnosis, I guess, of genuine hyperkinisis but that is so rare. It is like talking about yellow fever in America or something like that. Maybe not quite that rare. But that is what we are saying. That I think is a medical and neurological thing and I certainly don't want to make a judgment on whether drugs are proper there, or not.

Q: But there is a genuinely seductive argument for doing something for a kid who just can't sit still and in addition there are tremendous pressures that authorities -- schools for example -- bring to bear on a parent. They say, "Look, this kid is disrupting the whole class. We have to do something."

PS: You are quite right.

Q: Take it from there. What is a parent to do if these authority figures come and say, "Your kid's a problem"?

PS: That is quite right and this is the way often this happens. I think there are a number of things that we suggest in the book and there are no panaceas, here. I think the first thing is never to be hornswaggled by all this language and all these tests and screens and all this other stuff that is involved, as well as these labels. There is process of mistification. I was listening to a doctor earlier today, using all this jargon and the jargon kept coming with organic this and this and this. People get deluded by this. The second thing is, not to allow the schools to put you down. Many school system -- maybe most -- at least formerly -- not many but quite a few -- formally maintain a policy that can't be a condition of attending the school to be taking drugs. And I think that is certaining something that any parent has to insist on. Now there are also some at least rudimentary due-process rites, as far as suspensions, expulsions and placement in special classes is concerned, so there is some little bit of ground for resistance, there.

Q: But you tend to blame that kind of reform. You say that reform in due process has led to this basic technique of drugging the kids.

PS: That is true but it seems at the same time if the school says we are either going to have to throw your child out of school because we can't manage him, or you are going to have to put him on drugs or you are going to have to do something with a doctor. Then I think you can say, "No, you can't do that." You can say, "I want a hearing." Or something like that. That is now a legal right by a Supreme Court decision.

Q: What if the school says, "We think your kid needs medication and we suggest you see Dr. Jones"?

PS: Well I think then I would say, you know, I think, two things. First I would ask the school what is the problem, what is bugging you, what is bugging you, what is it the kid is doing wrong. The second thing is, if I were persuaded as a parent or the parent were persuaded: Yes indeed there is a problem caused by my kid, not by a teacher who can't handle this kind of thing -- again, always the assumption is the demands of the institution, the definitions of the institution are normative. They define what is wrong and proper and the kid is the deviant or the parents are the deviant so I would push on that and see what is really the problem and is the kid really -- then I would go and very carefully select, not take the doctor's name that the school provides but carefully select in the community with references and all of it -- and these people are very rare -- a pediatric neurologist, they are very scares, and it may mean traveling somewhere to a medical center, who really knows something about this stuff. And here and there people find each other. I mean now there has just been a suit filed in Southern California by a group of parents. By the way, not, as far as I can tell, not your upper middle class parents but people who are real working class people who are coerced into having the kid drugged by the school system. And in some cases where the drugs are prescribed by the school doctor without any medical examination, according to the suit, and I think -- well, I don't want to make a judgment but it rings like a lot of other stories that we know about. They are suing for, you know, a hundred billion dollards or something. Anyway they are suing the system, the school doctor, the school administrators saying first of all they were deceived, the kids were drugged without -- they were coerced into this, and the kid suffered all of these incredible side effects. Including one kid who had an epileptic seizure. They didn't know he was an epileptic. Nobody had ever tested him. That is another thing about this neurological examination. Before you can put a kid on a drug -- I mean these things have effects. They will--if you are epileptic it will create those seizures. Not Will but Can. So they had all these -- the kids have nightmares, the kids have all this. My point is not that you go and immediately hire a lawyer and file suit but you can often find other people in the same boat and maybe in some way you can organize to resist.

Q: Excuse me for interrupting. One of the reasons this is such a frightening book is that you and Diane say a lot of parents are not quite proud but at least they are organized in groups, with titles like Society of Parents with Hyperactive Children," they have meetings, they have teas.

Q: They find comfort from that.

Q: Because it is not their fault.

PS: That is right.

Q: Not only because it is not their fault, they are seeing some results in their children, they are seeing their children being helped.

PS: Well, yes, in some cases that is right. Because the kids behave better. You know the classic story of the mother who says, "Yes, I finally found this, and we finally got the drug or whatever, and now I have learned to love my son again." There is a kind of craziness about it. And all the stories about how hyperactive children break up marriages and, I mean, all kind of things. In many of these cases, you can say, yes, you are absolutely right, they are organized, and they press for more support for learning disabilities, kinds of programs, and for more money and all of that. Yes, I think the only thing you can say is -- we were talking in the context of some parent who wasn't buying this or was worried about it. The only thing you can say about those groups is some how you have to get the information out and keep challenging because what they do is they accept the interpretations of the practice and of the research that they get from their pediatricians or from the doctors who promote this kind of thing but they don't investigate it themselves or pretend not to. So they don't know what is in that literature and

really don't know how limited the possibilities are, here.

Q: And you are saying that when the kid gtes to be 18 or 20 and goes off ritalin then they are in for the real shock.

PS: Then they are in for a real shock and as I think a couple very respectable and responsible people in this field said, yes, raising a child is always difficult, raising a so-called hyperactive child is more difficult, sir. Meaning a kid who is more jumpy than other kids and more -- that is a difficult problem, but it seems to me there you gain -- it is much better to try to deal with all of this on a one-to-one, medium level with whatever resources you have, and patience. And then again -- there are at least situations where being more active than others is an advantage, it is an asset. And there again maybe it is partly that the society is creating less and less opportunities for people. I mean would it be a good thing if you are really hyperactive if you were living on a ranch or you were working in a lumber camp or something like that, or if you are a professional athlete. Something like that.

Q: You and Diane are wonderful makers and at one point you say something about how it is really the society that is dependent upon the drugs and puts them into the kids rather than the kids --

PS: Right. In a sense we all become developed -- it affects everybody. I mean -- let's say we are talking about drugging. Even if only a half million kids or a million kids are drugged, the point is the message gets across to everybody: "Behave or you will be drugged, too." But always the limits of what is considered normative keeps shrinking, so that devient, the kid who is somewhat jumpy made my somewhat less jumpiness prefectly acceptable. The fact that that devient is now no longer allowed to be jumpy makes me the jumpiest kid in the class and so it goes. It is like the whole business about taking the last car off the train. Right?

WB: Peter Schrag, co-author of The Myth of Hyperactivity .

(Button: pj&j sandwiches)

WB: Hyperactivity may be caused by what children eat. Dr. Ben Feingold is the retired head of the department of allergy at the Kaiser-Permanente Medical Center in San Francisco and author of Why Your Child is Hyperactive. Much of that book is a sharp attack on the artificial flavors and colors in our food. But the last forty pages contain diets for hyperactive and learning disables children. Dr. Feingold argues that some children are genetically pre-disposed toward hyperactivity, and that the biochemical effects of artificial flavors and colors trigger this genetic predisposition.

BF: I am talking about ritalin, I am talking about amphetamines, I am talking about tranquilizers like stelazine and melaril and talking about tufranone and all of these drugs.

JM: Why do school systems or doctors put kids on these drugs?

BF: First of all they are not knowledgeable yet and they have nothing else at hand. Now we have the diet. The thing to do is put them on the diet and if they respond you don't need anything. A great majority of them will respond. I think a lot of these people put on drugs, ther is nothing wrong with them. They are just reacting to a lot of hyperactive children in the room.

JM: Now in your book you seem to be saying that a lot of food addatives have the same effect as drugs, that kids in effect trip out on them.

BF: There is no question. You see, there is no difference between a food addative and a drug. A food addative is a low molecular compound, and so are the drugs. The only sad thing is that the food addatives have never been studied pharmacologically. We

don't know anything about their behavior. I think now with this happening, this observation will be a stimulus to be studies and we will know more about them.

JM: How long would it take to study these food addatives?

BF: Well, the food addatives I don't think will be studied that carefully, because that question was put to Senator Schmidt when we testified before the kennedy subcommittee on Health on September 11. I made the statement that not one of the food addatives, not one of the chemicals I should say introduced in our food supply as food addatives has ever been subjected to pharmacological studies such as required of a compound used as a drug and that was confirmed by Dr. Schmidt who followed me. In his testimony he confirmed that is true, there are none of them, Senator Kennedy asked how long it would take. He said it would not only take many, many years -- we have thousands of compounds that would take many years and it would take millions of dollars. It is just a formidable task, it would be almost impossible. That is why we are recommending that a logo or symbol be adopted to appear on every package of food to indicate the absence of colors and flavors. So those individuals who have to avoid them have the option, they don't have to buy those foods. If they avoid them then that is all there is to it. If they don't buy the compounds they won't make them.

JM: You have had a number of victories with the EDA recently, particularly the symbol that you hope to have put on labels. Could you describe that?

BF: Well, what the symbol is, you mean?

JM: Yes.

BF: Well, the symbol as it is designed right now is going to see a hexagonal and the reason it is hexagonal is that is the benzeen ring, that is the basic structure in the coal tar guise. Inside the benzene ring are going to be two sheaves of wheat to indicate purity and that is all there will be. When the public is acquainted with that symbol they will know there are no colors of flavors.

JM: And the sign will say "No artificial colors and flavors."

BF: That is right. That is all there is to it.

JM: Do artificial colors and flavors have any food value?

BF: Not at all. They are just a cosmetic function. If you take them out of the food supply they have no value whatsoever.

JM: Now Dr. Feingold, Peter Schrag and Diane Divoky in a new book called <u>The Myth of Hyperactivity</u> --

BF: I know that book, <u>The Myth of Hyperactivity</u>. It is a good book but the title is bad. It is misleading. What they are trying to indicate is that many children are labeled hyperactive and they are not hyperactive. But there is hyperactivity and there is delinquency and all that. They have documented the literature very well but it is unfortunate. The book suffers from a bad title.

JM: They say -- they admit there is hyperkinicia and they say it occurs perhaps in one in 2,000 children. You seem to be saying that it occurs perhaps in one in ten.

BF: I don't agree with them because I don't think they have the experience to justify that. All we have to do is look around. Even like tonight we have hundreds and hundreds of parents here tonight. Look how many there are here. I think the lowest percentage is 20 to 20 percent is really a good percentage and I think they will run as high as 22, 23, 25, up to 40 per cent. I don't think they are justified in that statement at all. They have no proof for that.

JM: One could say, do you have any proof that they could run as high as 40 per cent?

BF: Forty per cent I won't accept but I will say 22 to 28, yes. Now take an eminant psychiatrist like leon Heizenberg of Harvard, the professor of psychiatry at Harvard, he places the estimate amongest school children at 28 per cent. And you take psychologists and psychiatrists who talk about five per cent. All you have to do is look at the school system and see how many children there are and the demand for children who require special care. All you have to do is open your eyes and see the number of children there are. And it is mounting every year.

JM: Dr. Schrag and Divoky take the position that learning disability is a socially diagnosed kind of phenomeno that doesn't really exist except in a few cases and that it is a way of comforting white middle class parents. I notice you tonight saying, "Parents, it is not your fault, schools, it is not your fault," and blaming it on the food. Aren't you doing what Schrag and Divoky say?

BF: I am not doing what Schrag and Divoky say because they are saying what, social factors? It all depends on what they are including in social factors. Don't forget I am talking about colors and flavors. That is only one part of the whole spectrum of behavioral toxicology. We have to look at air pollutants, we have to look at many factors. That is not the only thing. We have to look at all things. We have to look at pesticides. Any chemical can be considered. I am looking at colors and flavors because I think that is the commonest cause. It runs about 30, 40 50 per cent. What about the other 50 per cent. we have to take a look at them. Then again we have always had this stuff with us. We have always had these probably on a genetic bais because there are mutations that take place from various factors. So we have lead to consider as a factor. We have many things. We have carbon monoxide. We have many things to consider. This is not the panacea, this is not the answer to all of us by any means.

JM: But you seem to be saying that the problem by and large are in one way or another chemical.

BF: Well, I think the chemical, biochemical basis for behavior, instead of talking about emotional -- in other words we have to reverese our thinking and say we blame the behavior of an individual -- for instance, a delinquent who develops as a delinquent purely because of the environmental. But he has to have first a basic kinetic profile to predispose him to react to these biochemical compounds and get a biochemical reaction. Once he has that the environment comes into play and there is an interaction between the environment and this. You don't cut it off. The whole thing. But you have to have the basis, first. You take two individuals, put them in the same environment. One will react and the other one doesn't. But once he has the biological predisposition to react in, environment is an important factor.

JM: So the biological profile -- I would like, if you would, just briefly describe your diet.

BF: The diet basically -- fundamentally the most important part of the diet is excluding any food that has no color, artificial color and flavor. So there is no food exempted, no food restricted, it is very liberal. As much of anything they want.

JM: What about fruits, peaches, berries?

BF: That is the individual. That is the second part of the diet. If they don't respond to elimination of colors and flavors then you have to eliminate all those with salicylates in them and that included the fruits and berries and all that. That is the next step.

JM: What about peanutbutter and jelly sandwiches, Dr. Feingold. Can American kids still eat peanutbutter and jelly sandwiches?

BF: Yes, they can have peanutbutter if it is pure peanut butter but remember so much of the peanut butter in the market is adulterated with all kinds of things in it. You have to look and see what the formula is. If you have pure peanuts, grind them up and make a peanut butter and if you use a jelly with a fruit they can tolerate, there is no harm in it at all. They can use it, certainly.

JM: They can have peanut butter and jelly but be careful?

BF: That is right. You have to be careful that they can tolerate it, that is all.

JM: Thanks very much.

BF: You are welcome.

JM: Dr. Ben Feingold, author of Why Your Child is Hyperactive. Schrag, Divoky and Feingold agree on at least one thing: too many children are being victimized by what Dr. Feingold calls "the promiscuous practice of treatment with behavior modifying drugs."

WB: Recent studies suggest that between 2 and 3 per cent of school-age children may be hyperactive, not 20 per cent as Dr. Feingold suggested. But a carefully controlled study by Dr. Keith Connors at the University of Pittsburgh strongly suggests that Dr. Feingold's diet is effective in the treatment of hyperactivity.

(button music)

JM: Remember if you want to on Options in Education, call 202-785-6464. If you want a transcript-- it's 50 cents-- a cassette--it costs $4.00--write Options in Education, 2025 M (as in Mustard) Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20036.

KM: Principal support for Options in Education is provided by the National Institute of Education.

WB: Other funds are provided by the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, the Ford Foundation, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The series is a co-production of the Institute for Educational Leadership of the George Washington University, and National Public Radio. The producer is Midge Hart. The Executive producer John Merrow.

I'm Wendy Blair.

(MUSIC)

This is NPR, National Public Radio/

We have omitted the weekly news from this transcript. In its place we are listing references which you might find useful and interesting.

Ben F. Feingold, M.D., Why Your Child is Hyperactive, Random House, New York, 1975

Peter Schrag and Diane Divoky, The Myth of the Hyperactive Child and Other Means of Child Control, Random House, New York, 1975

National Elementary Principal, May-June and July-August issues, 1975. Both issues are concerned with tests and testing.

The Chronicle of Higher Education, August; September 15; and November 3, 1975.

References CONTINUED

Dr. David Boesel, NIE, 1200 19th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (on hyperactivity)

Dr. Roy O. Forbes, Director, National Assessment of for Educational Progress, Education Commission of the States, Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203

Dr. Fred T. Wilhelms, former director, Association for Supervision; and Curriculum Development,(contact Mel Hayes, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Norville Northcut, Project Director, Adult Functional Competence, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

Dr. David Nolan, Director, Washington Office, Educational Testing Service, Suite 310, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036